



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The Koinon of Kosadar

Citation for published version:

Ecker, A & Eckhardt, B 2018, 'The Koinon of Kosadar: A Hellenistic private association in the Levant', *Israel Exploration Journal*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 192-207.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Israel Exploration Journal

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The Koinon of Kosadar in Maresha:
A Hellenistic Private Association in the Levant*

AVNER ECKER

BENEDIKT ECKHARDT

Avner Ecker,
Bar Ilan University,
The Martin (Szusz) Department of Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology,
Ramat Gan, 5920002,
Israel

Benedikt Eckhardt
University of Edinburgh
School of History, Archaeology and Classics
William Robertson Wing Old Medical School, 4 Teviot Pl
Edinburgh EH8 9AG
United Kingdom

* We thank Ian Stern, excavator of Maresha, who not only kindly permitted the publication of these finds but also read a draft of this paper and gave helpful comments. These ostraca, along with other ostraca from Maresha, were presented in November 2016 at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in San Antonio, in a session organized by Sandra Gambetti and Lutz Doering, and in October 2017 in the Ancient History seminar headed by Angelos Chaniotis at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Princeton. Lawrence T. Geraty graciously allowed us to reproduce his drawing of the bilingual ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kom. Kimberley Czajkowski proofread our text and corrected our English. We thank all these people, participants in the conference and seminar sessions, and the anonymous reviewers for their assistance, helpful suggestions and comments. The first draft of this paper was written while A. Ecker was a Fulbright post-doctoral fellow at Princeton University.

A late third or early second century BCE ostrakon discovered within the fills of a subterranean complex (no. 169) at the site of Maresha records the koinon (association) of Kosadar fining a certain person called Rhodon for the sum of no less than 40 silver Drachmae. The ostrakon was discovered in the company of two other similar albeit fragmentary ostraca. Since the association is named by a personal name we suggest it was a private association. Though the existence of fines is well recorded in regulations of private associations known from the Hellenistic world on stone and papyri, these are the first documents ever discovered that record the actual imposition of one. Furthermore, this is the earliest evidence for a private association in the Southern Levant, and as such constitutes a "missing link" in the development of Greek-type institutions in the region.

Approximately one thousand Greek texts from the site of the Idumaeen Hellenistic city of Maresha will be published alongside thousands of Aramaic texts in the forthcoming fourth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae* (CIIP IV), dedicated to inscriptions from Iudaea and Idumaea. Alongside c. 800 small ostraca and jar inscriptions, two copies of the much discussed letter of Seleucus IV to Heliodoros of 178 BCE have been found, as well as lead weights mentioning *agoranomoi*, a 'Sekoma' (measuring table), an *archon* of a group of Sidonians, magical texts, erotic graffiti and even a love poem written on the wall of a tomb.¹ With all these texts, written between the third and second centuries BCE, Maresha now emerges as a key site for the introduction and development of Greek language and culture in the Levant.

We single out here three ostraca whose intrinsic value merits their separate publication. These texts offer additional information about the Greek institutions of Maresha. Discovered in a

¹ Excavations were conducted between 1989 and 2000 by Amos Kloner on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority and since 2000 by Ian Stern and Bernie Alpert on behalf of Archaeological Seminars. For the published Greek and Aramaic inscriptions of Maresha see Kloner *et al.* 2010; Stern 2014; Stern and Alpert 2014; SEG 60, 1724–1741 (designated: Marisa); for the so-called Heliodoros inscription, see SEG 57, 1838. Two new copies have recently been identified by Yon 2015 (Byblos, now BE 2016, 537) and Cotton-Paltiel, Ecker and Gera 2017 (Maresha).

subterranean complex (no. 169) as part of a large assemblage of cultic artefacts, they are the earliest direct epigraphic evidence for a private association in the Hellenistic Levant.

THE TEXTS

1. *Reg. No. 169-67-1070-S1*² (fig. 1)

The text contains four lines in black ink on the interior of a body sherd of an unidentified vessel; discovered in subterranean complex 169 in room 10; lunate *sigma*; W-shapen *omega*; measurements: sherd: h 7.6, w 7.3 cm; letters: 0.7–1.1 cm

ZHMIOITO
KOINONKOΣA
ΔAΠOΣΠOΔΩNA
AP T M

Ζημιοῖ τὸ | κοινὸν Κοσα|δάρως Ῥόδωνα | ἀρ(γυρίου) (δραχμαῖς) μ´

‘The Koinon of Kosadar fines Rhodon 40 silver drachmae’

The ostrakon was discovered in the same hall as two other ostraca that probably contained the same type of text.

2. *Reg. No. 169-68-1233-S1* (fig. 2)

² The registration number consists of the following: the name of the subterranean complex (169), the locus number (67), the basket number (1070), and the item designation within the basket (S1). All documents discussed here are currently in the IAA offices in Har Hozvim, Jerusalem. The sigla follow the conventions of the CIIP.

Discovered in room 7; lunate *sigma*.

Measurements: sherd: h 2.9 cm, w 5.3 cm; letters: 0.4–1.0 cm

[in the inscription below – please confirm that the layout of the lines is intentional? (should lines 2 and 3 be further indented?) Also – is the number of periods intentional – do they indicate the number of letters presumed missing? And why in some cases are there periods [..] and in others dashes [–] – what does the different notation indicate?]

Commented [AE1]: The indentation is a mistake. As for the dots and dashes – they are intentional. Number of dots represent the number of missing letters, two consecutive dashes represent an unknown amount of missing text. + represents a letter seen but not discerned. All symbols follow the sigla of the CIIP and I added this to notenumber 2.

[..]MIOITO

[.....]NKOΣAΔA

[...]++[--]

[--]

[Zη]μοῖ τὸ | [κοινὸ]ν Κοσαδά[ροϛ]++[--] | [ἄρ(γυρίου) (δραχμαῖς) --?]

‘The Koinon of Kosadar fines [name + silver drachmae?]

3. *Reg. No. 169-68-1325-S6* (fig. 3)

Discovered in room 7.

Measurements: sherd: h 2.9 cm, w 5.3 cm; letters: 0.4–1.0 cm

ZHM[--]

AEI+[--]

AP? τ[--]

Zημ[οῖ τὸ κοινὸν Κοσαδάροϛ?] | AEI+[--] | ἄρ(γυρίου) (δραχμαῖς)[--]

‘The Koinon of Kosadar fines AEL... silver drachmae’

Commentary

Ζημιοῖ.—The right to fine its members is well attested among Greek private associations (see below).

τὸ κοινὸν Κοσαδάρος.—Kosadar, קוסעדִר (QWS^{DR}), is a known Idumaeian personal name in Aramaic inscriptions (Yardeni 2016: 712; s.v. Wuthnow 1930: 65), meaning ‘Qos helped’.

To the best of our knowledge, the name is known in Greek transliteration from only one other published inscription from Memphis (SB 1, 681; see discussion below).³ In the Egyptian inscription Kosadar is transcribed in the second declension, the name’s genitive being Κοσαδάρου; in contrast, based on the syntax of the ostrakon, it seems clear that it is here declined in the third declension, the nominative probably preserving the original Aramaic form—Κοσαδάρ.

The same phenomenon may be observed in the contemporary epitaphs from Maresha’s necropolis, where Ἀψελᾶμος (SEG 34, 1493) and Κοσνατᾶνος (SEG 34, 1486), both published in the nominative, could equally be read in the genitive, as most names inscribed over the *loculi* in the tombs.⁴

If the name of an association incorporates the name of its leader or founder, it usually does so with *περί*, *σύν*, or even *ἀπό*. However, there are some examples for associations where the founder/leader is attached to the name of the group by a mere genitive.⁵ The examples we

³ We know of another unpublished ostrakon from the antiquities market that probably originated from the area of Maresha bearing the name Κοσαδάρ in the nominative.

⁴ Oren and Rappaport 1984: 145 no. 10, 147 no. 18; there are five other instances of names in the nominative in these caves (nos. 2, 7, 9, 20, 22).

⁵ We give only the Hellenistic examples: I. Kallatis 255 (fourth century BCE): τοῖ σύσσιτοι τοῖ Τιμώνακτος IG II² 2720 (Athens, fourth century BCE): θιασῶται Δημότο (but this could be a subdivision

know use the terms *ἐταιρεία*, *θίασος*, *σύνοδος* and *σύσσιτοι*, which are comparable to the term *koinon* (a categorical distinction between such designations of private associations is impossible).

Ῥόδιον.—A similar name, Rhodion (Ῥόδιον), for a female, is attested in the third century BCE burial cave in Khirbet Za‘aquqa near Maresha (SEG 42, 1442, 1443).

Commented [AE2]: Ayin – added the ‘

AEI in document no. 3.—This is probably the name of the person fined. It is impossible to reconstruct it as there are too many options (a search through LGPN indices, for example, gives 21 different names).

ῥ(γυρίου) (δραχμαῖς) μ’ in document no. 3.—In the third line of document no. 3 only the letter *rho* may be ligated with the apex of the *alpha*. The top part of the symbol for drachmae (†) is visible.

The specification of silver drachmae entailed payment in actual silver coins, as opposed to any bronze equivalent (see Maresch 1996: 16–17).

Date

The finds from subterranean complex 169, in which these ostraca were discovered, date from between the fourth and late second centuries BCE (Eshel and Stern 2017: 9). The Greek

of a phratry); BCH 4, 1880, 175–176 no. 35–36 (Teos, third to first century BCE): ὁ θίασος ὁ Ἀναξινόλιδος; I. Kaunos 39 (third to first century BCE): [ὁ θιά]σος Θεοδότου τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρ[ο]υ; BCH 4, 1880, 164 no. 21 (Teos, 172–150 BCE): ὁ θίασος ὁ [Σι]μαλ[ίων]ος; I. Kyme 30 (second century BCE): οἱ θιασῶται οἱ Μενεκλείδα; I. Tomis 120 (first century BCE): Πασοῦς ἱερὸς θιασ[ος]. The name is reminiscent also of military units called after their commanding officer (e.g. OGIS 229, l. 103: τοῖς πεζοῖς τοῖς τεταγμένοις ὑπὸ Τίμωνα—‘the infantry serving under Timon’; see Chaniotis 2005: 95). However, there is, so far, no known military context to this or other ostraca from Maresha.

epigraphic corpus of Maresha and its surroundings, however, does not predate the third century BCE, and most of it is no earlier than the second half of that century (Kloner 2010; 2011).

The clearly separated letters, the mixed use of a round and pointed *alpha* (document no. 3), the curved righthand hasta of the *mu*, the *nu* composed of two parallel hastae and not going above the line are details reminiscent of early second-century BCE scripts used in letters written on Egyptian papyri (Seider 1990: 352–361).

Since the palaeographic study of the Maresha ostraca is still in progress, we reproduce here a drawing of our main text (fig. 4), for comparison with the drawings of the bilingual Aramaic/Greek ostrakon of 277 or 241 BCE (Geraty 1975) discovered in nearby Khirbet el-Kom and a tag of the year 189 BCE from Maresha (unpublished). Note the similarity of our text not only to the earlier ostrakon, but also to the later one, especially in the letter *alpha*, the ligature of the *alpha* and the *rho* and the general adherence to the line of the text.

Based on all of the above, we date these documents to the end of the third and the beginning of the second century BCE.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The site of Maresha is riddled with underground complexes hewn into its soft limestone bedrock. These subterranean complexes are assumed to have been filled with the debris of the buildings that stood above them, but it is often difficult to understand the various layers of the stratigraphy of the dump (Eshel and Stern 2017: 9).

All three ostraca were discovered in the main hall of Subterranean Complex 169, consisting of Rooms 7, 10 and 11 (for plan, see Stern and Alpert 2014). The three documents, which belong to the same type and most probably to the same institution, prove that the fills in which they were discovered originated from the same source.

Subterranean Complex 169 is unique in its wealth of cult-related finds: 134 Aramaic divination ostraca (out of 354 Aramaic texts), hundreds of clay figurines, stone phalli, astragali,

kernoi and a set of enigmatic, intentionally-punctured vessels. This rich assemblage and the discovery of the Heliodoros inscription in the adjacent Subterranean Complex 57 have led the excavators to suggest that Subterranean Complex 169 was filled with the debris of an above-ground cult place (Eshel and Stern 2017).

The *koinon* of Kosadar was likely an association that also participated in the cult activities that took place in or above Subterranean Complex 169.

DISCUSSION

The Fine

We do not know why Rhodon and the other individuals had to pay a fine. For comparison, we append to this article an overview of offences and their allotted fines in both Greek and Egyptian Hellenistic associations before the imperial era. The standard fine in Greek associations was 50 drachmae (8 out of 19 recorded cases in the period). While the fines in the Egyptian associations were less standardized, they were generally lower. Most Egyptian fines that can be correctly compared in silver drachmae before the monetary reforms of the late third century BCE range between 2 and 16 drachmae, usually in increments of four drachmae (2 *kite*), one case being 1 drachma (half a *kite*) and one 60 drachmae (3 *deben*). The sum of 40 drachmae in our ostrakon is reminiscent of Egyptian tetradrachma / 2 *kite* based fines, while the value is more in line with the fines of Greek associations.

How associations enforced payments remains an open question. The Egyptian groups gave authority to their leader, who could come to a member's home. Due to the contractual nature of membership, external courts could presumably be involved, but internal jurisdiction was clearly preferred.⁶ Although some papyri elucidate the financial dealings of associations, at least in Egypt, our ostraca seem to be the first pieces of evidence for an association actually punishing individuals. Ostraca recording financial demands by cult associations are known from

⁶ For both Egypt and Greece, see San Nicolò 1927: 291–294.

the temple of Seth at Mut al-Kharab (Vittmann 2012), but they do not refer to fines. The Demotic accounts of associations list the membership fees (varying according to status) or the expenses, but not fines.⁷ The fact that Rhodon's ostrakon was found together with two others indicates that the association of Kosadar had a regular procedure for fining its members. Perhaps part of the procedure was to hand the fined member such letters.

The Koinon of Kosadar and Associations in the Levant

It has often been assumed that the spread of Greek civic institutions in the Hellenistic Levant also led to a spread of Greek private associations, which were flourishing in that period. Poseidonios of Apameia in fact gives the impression that by the first century BCE, Syrian cities were filled by κοινὰ τῶν συνδείπνων, most likely 'associations of fellow-diners'.⁸ Due to the lack of inscriptions from this period, however, the spread of associations remains largely a conjecture. Syrians and Phoenicians certainly founded associations elsewhere, e.g. in Athens or Delos, and there have been attempts to reconstruct a 'Semitic' type of association from their inscriptions,⁹ but actual evidence from the region itself is almost completely absent. There were πολιτεύματα of soldiers at Sidon in the late third century BCE, and the groups of Sidonians in Jamnia, Shechem and Maresha may plausibly be explained as similar institutions (although no such designation is attested for them).¹⁰ However, in light of the Egyptian evidence for πολιτεύματα and the diplomatic correspondence of the Sidonian groups with Seleucid kings, their interpretation as private associations (rather than ethnic groups settled there by the Ptolemaic administration)

⁷ Cf. Monson 2006: 223–224 on the lists of contributions; two new lists of expenses are published by Quack 2017: 311–318.

⁸ FGrH 87 F 10 (Athenaeus, *Dipn.* 5,210e–f; cf. 12,527e–f); cf. already Ziebarth 1896: 125.

⁹ Most recently by Baslez 2013.

¹⁰ Πολιτεύματα in Sidon: Macridy 1904; cf. discussion by Huß 2011: 288–289. Sidonians: OGIS 593 (Peters and Thiersch 1905: 37–40; Maresha); CIIP III 2267 (Isaac 1991; Jamnia); Josephus, *Ant.* 12.258 (Shechem). The Sidonians of Maresha had an ἄρχων like πολιτεύματα in Egypt. For the identification of the Sidonian groups as πολιτεύματα, see Isaac 1991: 139; Cohen 2006: 271.

remains doubtful.¹¹ One inscription from Gerasa, published in 2006, that mentions [ο]ἱ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς [τ]οῦ ἀμμανα ἐτ[αι]ρείας (‘those of the association of Zeus of the *hammana*’) has so far been the only pre-Roman piece of epigraphic evidence for private associations in the region (Gatier and Seigne 2006; SEG 56, 1920). The new κοινόν from Maresha may thus fill an important gap in our knowledge.

Apart from Poseidonios’ remark, the term κοινόν—the most common word for an association in the Greek world—is unattested in the Levant before the Roman period. From the inscription of the Sidonians in Piraeus we can learn that *gw* could be seen as a Semitic equivalent, but its attestation in an inscription from Tyre has a rather different meaning.¹² In a bilingual sealing from Kedesh dated to 164 BCE, the word κοινοδήμ[ιον] (a common assembly?) is merely transliterated *kyndmyn* (Ariel and Naveh 2003: 64–67). Finally, the scrolls found at Qumran frequently mention a group or movement called *ha-yahad*, which has perhaps correctly been explained as a Hebrew rendering of τὸ κοινόν, as both are nouns based on the roots ‘together’.¹³ The earliest actual attestation of an association using the term is provided by the κοινόν τῶν μαχαροποιῶν (‘the association of the cutlery makers’) at the sanctuary of Eshmun in Sidon (SEG 55, 1660; 48/7 BCE).

However, associations flourished not only in Greece, but also in Egypt. Demotic statutes as well as some Greek papyri attest to a tradition of associations that partly overlapped with the one known from Greek inscriptions but that seems to have developed independently.¹⁴ The earliest Demotic statute of an association predates the earliest one known from Greece (de Cenival 1988). The status of the Demotic groups in particular is still subject to some debate. They

¹¹ For the term ‘private association’ and a set of criteria to be met, cf. Gabrielsen and Thomsen 2015.

¹² KAI 60 (third century BCE), l. 2 and 7 for the Sidonians in the Piraeus: the Phoenician text consistently uses *gw* to refer to the association, while the Greek text identifies it as τὸ κοινόν τῶν Σιδωνίων. Ameling (1990: 197 n. 48) points to KAI 17 from Tyre, but there, Ashtart is ‘in her temple’, *bgwhqdš*.

¹³ Dombrowski 1966. Van der Kooij (2011: 119–122) prefers to see it as an equivalent of δῆμος, but does not discuss the possible context of Greek private associations.

¹⁴ This remains true despite the pertinent remarks by Paganini 2017.

could be connected to sanctuaries and may have fulfilled official functions there, assembling priests and supporting personnel. In light of Ptolemaic control over Maresha in the third century and the lack of Greek parallels from the Levant, our association could also be seen in this context. In addition, the term κοινόν could be used to designate ethnic groups of mercenaries in Ptolemaic Cyprus, but also in Memphis, where a κοινὸν τῶν κτιστῶν (“association of founders”) consisted largely of Idumaeans.¹⁵ However, these groups are not attested until the second century BCE (when Maresha was already under Seleucid rule) and would not be named after a person.

Our ostraca do not give us much information about the type of group we are dealing with. As Kosadar seems to be a person, the best parallels can be found in the Greek tradition of private associations. Associations named after a person mentioned in the genitive are rare but do exist (see above, Commentary and n. 5). Kosadar may thus have founded the group, which does not necessarily imply that he was still alive when these ostraca were written, since the association could have taken over commemorative functions for him after his death. It is also possible that the group was founded to commemorate him—but we would have expected some clearer mention of that in the title (e.g., SEG 57, 1188 from Lydia; Jones 2008). The name Kosadar leaves no doubt that the association consisted at least in part of Idumeans; if Rhodon was indeed a member, this could suggest ethnically diverse membership.

The discovery of a private association in Maresha operating in the mode of other Hellenistic associations is yet another example of the adoption of Greek culture among the local population, a practice that goes well beyond the bare administrative adaptations necessary for life under Greek monarchs.

APPENDIX: OVERVIEW OF FINES AND OFFENCES IN PRIVATE ASSOCIATIONS IN GREECE, THE AEGEAN AND EGYPT

¹⁵ SB 1, 681. On such groups, see Thompson 2011; Kruse 2015.

The following overview excludes the data from the imperial era.¹⁶

Greece and the Aegean

- *Proposing or supporting an alteration of a decree or the association's law as a whole*: 50 drachmae in one case from Athens and possibly one from Delos; 100 drachmae in a case from Rhodes; 500 drachmae in the case of Epikteta's family association on Thera; 6,000 drachmae in the case of the Berytian Poseidoniastai on Delos.¹⁷
- *Magistrates not abiding by the association's decisions*; specifically by a) *not announcing the honours decreed for a benefactor*: 50 drachmae in three cases from Athens and possibly one from Mantinea; 4 drachmae in another case from Athens; 100 drachmae in a case from Rhodes; 6,000 drachmae in the case of the Poseidoniastai;¹⁸ b) *failing in other ways to fulfill the expectations*, e.g., by not providing necessary equipment or not respecting rules on rotation in office: up to 50 drachmae in a case from Athens, 100 drachmae in a group of priestesses in Mantinea, between 100 and 300 drachmae in Epikteta's association (depending on the office implicated), 1,000 drachmae in the case of the Poseidoniastai.¹⁹

¹⁶ For a list of selected references to fines focusing primarily on the imperial period, see the index of Harland 2014: 498.

¹⁷ IG II² 1361, l. 13–14 (Athens, 330–324/3 BCE); I. Délos 1523, l. 9–12 (late second century BCE), where the sum is restored as πεντ[α]κ[ο]σί[α]ς? (500); for 50, see Poland 1909: 449; IG XII,1 155 (Rhodes, second century BCE), l. D 101–102; IG XII,3 330 (Thera, 210–195 BCE), ll. 261–264; I. Délos 1520, ll. 64–65 (after 153/2 BCE).

¹⁸ IG II² 1263, l. 44–45 (Athens, 300/299 BCE); 1273, ll. 21–24 (Athens, 265/4 BCE); MDAI(A) 66 (1941), 228 no. 4, ll. 18–19 (138/7 BCE); IG V,2 265, ll. 35–36 (Mantinea 64–61 BCE; the sum is almost completely restored); IG II² 1297, ll. 17–18 (Athens, 236/5 BCE); IG XII,1 155 (Rhodes, second century BCE), ll. D 91–92; I. Délos 1520, ll. 66–68.

¹⁹ IG II² 1328, ll. 12–13, 18–19 (Athens, 183/2 BCE); IG V,2 266, ll. 43–45 (Mantinea, 46–43 BCE); IG XII,3 330, ll. 143 (100 drachmae), 161–162, 173–175 (150 drachmae), 215–217 (300 drachmae); I. Délos 1520, ll. 78–81.

- *Committing a specific cultic offence*: 50 drachmae for sacrificing beside the altar (παραβώμια θύειν) in a case from Athens.²⁰
- *A member not participating in a meeting although he or she would have been able to*: 2 drachmae in one case from Athens, 6 drachmae (in effect 3) in another.²¹

The Dionysiac artists could charge enormous sums,²² but can hardly be compared to local cult associations, as their members could quite literally embark on diplomatic missions in which adhering to procedure was vital. It should also be noted that many association inscriptions mention offences without specifying a fine; one association explicitly left the sum open in order to be able to determine it at will.²³

Egypt

In light of the possible Ptolemaic context and the proximity to Egypt, the fines mentioned in Demotic papyri should also be considered. The list of offences in these statutes is generally much more detailed and largely uniform across the different statutes. The following overview groups together the common offences and gives the range of attested penalties, translating *kite* (= 2 silver drachmae) and *deben* (= 20 silver drachmae) into drachmae and distinguishing between the sums before the so-called monetary reforms of 211/10 BCE (**A**)²⁴ and after (**B**).²⁵

²⁰ IG II² 1361 (330–324/3 BCE), ll. 7–8.

²¹ IG II² 1361, ll. 19–20 (330–324/3 BCE); IG II² 1339, ll. 9–12 (57/6 BCE). As the normal fee was 3 drachmae, the actual fine in the latter case is 3, rather than 6, drachmae.

²² I. Iasos 152, ll. 19–25 (mid-second century BCE): 1,000 drachmae for not participating in a festival at Iasos; SIG³ 705, ll. 36–38 (Delphi, 112 BCE): 10 talents (= 60,000 drachmae) for disobeying the settlement regarding a conflict between the Athenian and the Isthmian synod (but the main factor here is the Roman senate).

²³ IG II² 1275 (Athens, late fourth/early third century BCE), ll. 16–17: τιμώσαν αὐτὸν καθότι ἂν δοκεῖ τοῖς κοινῶι.

²⁴ We use the ‘traditional year’ of these reforms; on their date and nature, see Fischer-Bovet and Clarysse 2012. This overview updates and restructures the table of fines that can be found in [de] Cenival 1972:

- *Turning away from/disrespecting the statutes of the association as such:* **A** 60 drachmae; **B** 18,000–40,000 drachmae, but in one case only 100, in another 1,000.²⁶
- *Committing adultery with another member's wife:* **A** 16 drachmae; **B** 2,000–6,000 drachmae.²⁷
- *Falsely accusing another member of leprosy:* **A** 16 drachmae; **B** 2,000 drachmae.²⁸
- *Not taking over a position of responsibility despite being chosen to do so:* **A** 8–12 drachmae; **B** 400–1,000 drachmae.²⁹
- *Obstructing a leader's visit to one's home (to collect money or see sureties):* **A** 12 drachmae; **B** frequently 500 drachmae, but in two cases 4,000 and 6,000 respectively.³⁰

200–201. For a discussion of fines in relation to wheat prices and the hierarchy of rules, see Monson 2006: 230–234.

²⁵ Document abbreviations (where possible, references follow the standard papyrological Checklist of Editions: <https://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html>; for the other documents, see the editions cited): a = P. Mainz. dem. 10 (245–243 BCE; Vittmann 2011); b = P. Tebt. suppl. 1578 (Tebtynis, c. 250–210 BCE; Monson 2013); c = P. Assoc. pp. 3–10 (Qus, 223 BCE); d = P. Stan. Green. dem. 21 (Bakchias?, c. 190–170 BCE; Arlt and Monson 2010); e = P. Assoc. pp. 39–40 (Arsinoe, 179 BCE); f = P. Mil. Vogl. dem. inv. 77 (Tebtynis, 178 BCE; Bresciani 1994); g = P. Assoc. pp. 45–51 (Tebtynis, 157 BCE); h = P. Assoc. pp. 59–61 (Tebtynis, 151 BCE); i = P. Assoc. pp. 63–66 (Tebtynis, 147 BCE); j = P. Assoc. pp. 73–78 (Tebtynis, 145 BCE); k = P. Assoc. pp. 83–91 (Tebtynis, 137 BCE); l = P. Assoc. pp. 93–97 (Tebtynis, 137 BCE); m = P. Assoc. pp. 103–107 (Djeme, 109 BCE?); n = P. Assoc. pp. 118–119 (Djeme, 108 BCE); o = P. Assoc. pp. 125–126 (Djeme, 107 BCE?). The newly published text P. Suzuki Collection d 24 is too fragmentary to be of help here. We only record those instances where a concrete sum is mentioned.

²⁶ c 26–28; k 27–28 (20,000 + 20,000); n ii 1–2 (12,000 + 12,000); o 4–7 (6,000 + 6,000 + 6,000). 100: l 10–11. 1,000: d 7.

²⁷ c 10–11; i 22; k 19.

²⁸ c 10; g 17–18; i 22; j 20; k 18–19.

²⁹ b 2; c 21; g 15, 23–24; i 16; j 24; k 10, 22.

³⁰ c 21–22; h 7; i 8–9; j 7–8; k 9. 4,000: f 6; 6,000: l 6. Cf. 20 drachmae in b 3 for obstructing the leader in any way.

- *Insulting or beating higher-ranking officials of the group*: **A** 4–16 drachmae; **B** 800–2,400 drachmae, but in one case only 100.³¹ Fines were higher when the representative himself committed the offence.
- *Not giving legal or financial assistance to another member*: **A** 8 drachmae; **B** 200–1,500 drachmae, but in one case 6,000.³²
- *Turning to an external court (particularly after the association had already passed a verdict) or complaining about another member to the authorities*: **A** 2–8 drachmae; **B** 500–2,000 drachmae, but in one case only 120.³³
- *Insulting or beating another member or a lesser official of the group*: **A** 2–4 drachmae; **B** 500–2,000 drachmae.³⁴
- *Not delivering one's contribution on the stipulated day*: **A** 4 drachmae; **B** 500 drachmae, but in one case 3,000.³⁵
- *Stealing from the group*: **B** 300 drachmae.³⁶
- *Not attending a procession of the gods, a general meeting or the funeral of a member/a member's relative* (descending order of penalties): **A** 1–2 drachmae; **B** usually 40–600 drachmae, but in two cases 1,000 and 3,000 respectively.³⁷

³¹ a 4 (distinction between doing it in the association or in public); c 13–14; f 21, 26; g 20–21; i 24–25; j 21–22. 100: m 11.

³² c 15; i 22–23; d 3; f 23; j 22–23; k 20–22, 26; l 9. 6,000: l 7.

³³ a 7; c 22–25; g 17–19; i 20–21; j 19–20; k 18. 120: d 4.

³⁴ a 5 (same distinction as above, n. 31); c 14; f 21; g 19–20, 25; i 24–26; j 20–21, 23–24.

³⁵ c 8–9; f 8 (reconstructed); g 9–10; h 9; j 9–10; k 9–10. 3,000: l 6.

³⁶ d 3 (same offence in c 9–10, but the sum is not preserved).

³⁷ c 9, 12–13, 18–19; e 7; g 14, 16, 24; h 10–11; i 12–13, 15; j 12–13, 16; k 24; m iii 8–9. 1,000: f 27; 3,000: l 6–7 (but this may not refer to a meeting of the association itself).

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

<i>BE</i>	<i>Bulletin épigraphique</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
CIIP	Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae
FGrH	Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker
I. Délos	Inscriptions de Délos (ed. F. Durrbach), Paris, 1926–1937
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae
I. Iasos	Die Inschriften von Iasos (ed. W. Blümel), Bonn, 1985
I. Kallatis	Inscriptions grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure. Vol. 3: Callatis et son territoire (ed. A. Avram), Bucharest, 1999
I. Kaunos	Die Inschriften von Kaunos (ed. C. Marek), Munich, 2006
I. Kyme	Die Inschriften von Kyme (ed. H. Engelmann), Bonn, 1976
I. Tomis	Inscriptions grecques et latines de Scythie Mineure. Vol. 2: Tomis et territorium (ed. I. Stoian), Bucharest, 1987
LGPN	Lexicon of Greek Personal Names
<i>MDAI(A)</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Athenische Abteilung</i>
OGIS	Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (ed. W. Dittenberger), 2 vols., Leipzig, 1903–1905
P. Suzuki Collection	The Demotic and Hieratic Papyri in the Suzuki Collection of Tokai University, Japan (eds. R. Jasnow et al.), Atlanta GA, 2016
SB	Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
SIG	Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum (ed. W. Dittenberger), 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1915–1924

Ameling, W.

1990 Κοινὸν τῶν Σιδωνίων, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 81: 189–199

Ariel, D.T. and Naveh, J.

2003 Selected Inscribed Sealings from Kedesh in the Upper Galilee, *BASOR* 329: 61–80

Arlt, C. and Monson, A.

2010 Rules of a Religious Association, in Knuf, H., Leitz, C. and von Recklinghausen, D. (eds.), *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen*, Leuven: 113–122

Baslez, M.-F.

2013 Les associations à Délos: depuis les débuts de l'indépendance (fin du IV^e siècle) à la période de la colonie athénienne (milieu du II^e siècle), in Fröhlich, P. and Hamon, P. (eds.), *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (III^e siècle av. J.-C.–II^e siècle apr. J.-C.)*, Geneva: 227–249

Bresciani, E.

1994 Nuovi statuti demotici di 'confraternite' dalla necropoli dei coccodrilli a Tebtynis (P. Vogl. demot. Inv. 77 e Inv. 78), *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 17: 49–67

de Cenival, F.

1972 *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques*, Cairo

- 1988 Papyrus Seymour de Ricci: Le plus ancien des règlements d'association religieuse (4ème siècle av. J.-C.) (Pap. Bibl. Nationale E 241), *Revue d'Égyptologie* 39: 37–46
- Chaniotis, A.
- 2005 *War in the Hellenistic World: a Social and Cultural History*, Oxford
- Cohen, G.M.
- 2006 *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley
- Cotton-Paltiel, H.M., Ecker, A. and Gera, D.
- 2017 Juxtaposing Literary and Documentary Evidence: A New Copy of the So-Called Heliodoros Stele and the Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae (CIIP), *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 60: 1–15
- Dombrowski, B.W.
- 1966 הַיְיָד in IQS and τὸ κοινόν. An Instance of Early Greek and Jewish Synthesis, *Harvard Theological Review* 59: 293–307
- Eshel, E. and Stern, I.
- 2017 Divination Texts of Maresha—Archaeology and Texts, *Archaeology and Text* 1: 7–26
- Fischer-Bovet, C. and Clarysse, W.
- 2012 Silver and Bronze Standards and the Date of P. Heid. VI 383, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 58: 36–42

Gabrielsen, V. and Thomsen, C.A.

2015a (eds.), *Private Associations and the Public Sphere*, Copenhagen

2015b Introduction: Private Groups, Public Functions? in Gabrielsen and Thomsen
2015a: 7–24

Gatier, P.-L. and Seigne, J.

2006 *Le hammana de Zeus à Gerasa*, *Electrum* 11: 171–189

Geraty, L.T.

1975 The Khirbet el-Khom Bilingual Ostrakon, *BASOR* 220: 55–61

Harland, P.A.

2014 *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, II. *North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin

Huß, W.

2011 *Die Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Reiches*, Munich

Isaac, B.

1991 A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians, *IEJ* 41: 132–144

Jones, C.P.

2008 A Hellenistic Cult-Association, *Chiron* 38: 195–204

Kloner, A.

- 2010 Maresha: Archaeological and Epigraphic Overview, in Kloner, A., Eshel, E., Korzakova, H.B., Finkielsztein, G., *Maresha Excavations Final Report III. Epigraphic Finds from the 1989–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem: 205–226
- 2011 The Introduction of Greek Language and Culture in the Third Century BCE, according to the Archaeological Evidence in Idumaea, in Grabbe, L.L. and Lipschits, O. (eds.), *Judah between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule*, London, 158–162

Kloner, A., Eshel, E., Korzakova, H.B. and Finkielsztein, G.

- 2010 *Maresha Excavations Final Report III. Epigraphic Finds from the 1989–2000 Seasons*, Jerusalem

Kruse, T.

- 2015 Ethnic *Koina* and *Politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt, in Gabrielsen and Thomsen 2015a: 270–300

Macridy, T.

- 1904 À travers les nécropoles sidoniennes. I. Stèles peintes de Sidon, *RB* 1.4: 547–556

Maresch, K.

- 1996 *Bronze und Silber. Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Munich

Monson, A.

- 2006 The Ethics and Economics of Ptolemaic Religious Associations, *Ancient Society* 36: 221–238

2013 Rules of an Association of Soknebtunis, in Ast, R., Cuvigny, H., Hickey, T.M. and Lougovaya, J. (eds.), *Papyrological Texts in Honor of Roger S. Bagnall*, Durham NC: 209–214.

Oren, E.D. and Rappaport, U.

1984 The Necropolis of Maresha–Beth Govrin, *IEJ* 34: 114–153

Paganini, M.

2017 Greek and Egyptian Associations in Egypt. Fact or Fiction? in Chrubasik, B. and King, D. (eds.), *Hellenism and the Local Communities of the Eastern Mediterranean. 400 BCE–250 CE*, Oxford: 131–154

Peters, J. P. and Thiersch, H.

1905 *Painted Tombs in the Necropolis of Marissa (Marêshah)*, London

Poland, F.

1909 *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig

Quack, J.F.

2017 Eine weise Stimme der Autorität (Papyrus Amherst Eg. XLIII.1 rt.): Mit Anhängen über Abrechnungen (Papyrus Amherst Eg. XLIII.1 vs. und XLIII.2), in Jasnow, R. and Widmer, G. (eds.), *Illuminating Osiris. Egyptological Studies in Honor of Mark Smith*, Atlanta GA: 303–318

San Nicolò, M.

1927 Zur Vereinsgerichtsbarkeit im hellenistischen Ägypten, *Επιτύμβιον. Heinrich Swoboda dargebracht*, Reichenberg: 255–300

Commented [BE3]: Yes, it is the title of a memorial volume. No editors are mentioned anywhere in the book.

Seider, R.

1990 *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri* III, Stuttgart

Stern, I.

2014 *Excavations of Maresha Subterranean Complex 57: The 'Heliodoros' Cave*, Oxford

Stern, I. and Alpert, B.

2014 Maresha, Subterranean Complex 169: Preliminary Report, *Hadashot Arkheologiyot* 126, http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/Report_Detail_Eng.aspx?id=12643 (last viewed: 27/7/2018)

Thompson, D.J.

2011 Ethnic Minorities in Hellenistic Egypt, in van Nijf, O.M. and Alston, R. (eds.), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven: 101–117

Van der Kooij, A.

2011 The Yahad—What Is in a Name? *DSD* 18: 109–128

Vittmann, G.

2011 Eine Urkunde mit den Satzungen eines Kultvereins (P. dem. Mainz 10), in Feder, F., Morenz, L.D. and Vittmann, G. (eds.), *Von Theben nach Giza. Festmiszellen für Stefan Grunert zum 65. Geburtstag*, Göttingen: 169–179

2012 Demotische und kursivhieratische Ostraka aus Mut al-Kharab (Dakhleh), in Bagnall, R.S., Davoli, P. and Hope, C.A. (eds.), *The Oasis Papers 6. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the Dakhleh Oasis Project*, Oxford: 19–31

Wuthnow, H.

1930 *Die semitischen Menschnamen in griechischen Inschriften und Papyri des vorderen Orients*, Leipzig

Yardeni, A.

2016 *The Jeselsohn Collection of Aramaic Ostraca from Idumea*, Jerusalem

Yon, J.-B.

2015 De Marisa à Byblos avec le courrier de Séleucos IV. Quelques données sur Byblos hellénistique, in Aliquot, J. and Bonnet, C. (eds.), *La Phénicie hellénistique* (Topoi Supplement 13), Lyon: 89–105

Ziebarth, E.

1896 *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, Leipzig

***** figure captions*****

Fig 1. Text no. 1 (photo by Z. Radovan)

Fig. 2. Text no. 2 (photo by Z. Radovan)

Fig. 3. Text no. 3 (photo by Z. Radovan)

Fig 4. 1) Bilingual ostrakon from Kh. el-Kom (drawing from Geraty 1975); Greek text (SB 18, 13299; lines 5–9): (ἔτους) ς ιβ μηνὸς Πα|νήμου. ἔχει Νικ|ήρατος Σοββα|θο παρὰ Κοσίδη κα|π|ήλου (δραχμᾶς) λβ'; 'Year 6, 12th day of month Panemoth. Nikeratos son of Sabbathos receives from Koside, the money lender, 32 drachmai'; 2) text no. 1 (drawing by A. Ecker); 3) tag from Maresha, reg. no. 89-35-410-S1; text: δκρ̄ παρὰ το(...) καὶ Σελλέμας; '(year) 124 (SE = 189 BCE), from To(...) and Sellema'